

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/732,669 | BLUMENKOPF ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Venkataraman Balasubramanian | 1624 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Venkataraman Balasubramanian. (3) Tim Creagan.
 (2) Christine Lee. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 March 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-20, 22 and 25-31.

Identification of prior art discussed: all applied.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Amendment to obviate the 112 rejections, prior art rejections, and obviousness-type double patenting rejections were discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

V. Balasubramanian
 Examiner's signature, if required